Mercury TMDL's and Permitting Issues

Taconite Industry Cost Reduction Initiative March 17, 2003

Outline

- TMDL's or EPA Listing Category 4b
 - Background
 - Mercury TMDL's
 - Category 4b
- Permitting
 - Background
 - Statewide/Multi-discharger Variance
 - Other Approaches

Definitions

- Impaired Water Water-body where ambient levels exceed numeric or narrative Water Quality Standards (WQS) for a specific pollutant.
 - Water column
 - EPA Fish Tissue Criterion (.3 mg/kg)
 - Fish tissue (MN Dept. of Health)

- Section 303(d) List Clean Water Act requirement that States must submit to EPA a list of waters within the state which do not meet numeric or narrative WQS.
 - Currently submitted every 2 years
 - Last submitted 2002
 - Planning for 2004 submittal underway
 - Due 4/1/04
 - 2004 Integrated 303(d)/305(b) Report ????

- 305(b) Report Report the MPCA submits to EPA assessing the quality of the State's waters
 - Currently submitted every 5 years
 - Last submitted ????
 - Approximately 10 % of Minnesota's waters have been assessed
 - 5% Stream miles
 - 12% Lakes

- Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report – EPA guidance to the States for integrating the development and submission of 305(b) water quality reports and Section 303(d) lists of impaired waters
 - Guidance issued November 19, 2001
 - 5 part list

- TMDL Process which establishes a load reduction strategy to bring the impaired water-body or watershed into compliance with WQS
 - wasteload allocations for point sources
 - load allocations for non-point sources
 - margin of safety
 - future growth component

Impaired Water Regulatory Impact

- Once a water-body is considered impaired "no new or increased discharges" are allowed for the pollutant causing the impairment until a TMDL or reduction strategy has been established.
 - e.g. restrictions on: residential development, increased industrial and municipal capacity, impervious surfaces, new facilities etc.

Impaired Water Regulatory Impact (cont.)

- Once a TMDL or reduction strategy is in place "new or increased discharges" are possible by:
 - demonstrating a continued downward trend in pollutant levels (increase is de minimis, maintains continued progress.)
 - demonstration that water quality standards will be attained within a reasonable period of time.

Minnesota
Mercury
Water Quality Standards (WQS)
and
Impaired Waters

Minnesota's Mercury WQS

- Great Lakes Basin
 - 1.3 ng/l (Wildlife based)
 - Background levels mainly above standard
- Statewide
 - 6.9 ng/l (Human Health based)
 - Background levels generally lower than standard
- Rainfall (Comparison)
 - 10-12 ng/l

Mercury Sources

- Atmospheric Deposition
 - International and National
 - Estimated between 80 90 % from global sources
 - 10's to 100's of LBS/facility/year
- Water Discharges
 - Tenths to hundredths of LBS/facility/year
- Products
 - Switches, Thermometers, Bulbs, etc.

Minnesota Mercury Impaired Waters

- Great Lakes Basin (WQS = 1.3 ng/l)
 - Numerous waters listed on 2002 Impaired Waters List
 - Most, if not all, waters will have water column exceedances
 - Once EPA Fish Tissue Criterion promulgated into MN WQS numerous exceedances expected
 - MDH Fish Advisories for all tested waters expected
 - Most waters listed based on fish advisories
 - Atmospheric deposition major source
 - International and National

Minnesota Mercury Impaired Waters

- Statewide (WQS = 6.9 ng/l)
 - Few waters listed on 2002 Impaired Waters List
 - Most waters will meet water column except during wet weather events
 - Once EPA Fish Tissue Criterion promulgated into MN WQS numerous exceedances expected
 - MDH Fish Advisories for most, if not all, tested waters expected
 - Most waters listed based on fish advisories
 - Atmospheric deposition major source
 - International and National



Mercury TMDL's

- National Concerns
 - Are mercury impaired waters suitable for TMDL development (EPA/ECOS/Quicksilver)?
 - Atmospheric deposition (major source): who and how should it be handled?
 - Source identification and level of contribution?
 - What is the appropriate endpoint (fish tissue, water column, fish advisories)?
 - Water-body specific, watershed or regional TMDL's Pre/Post TMDL Permitting?
 - NPDES/TMDL Permitting?

Minnesota's Mercury TMDL Timeline

- TMDL completion scheduled for 2015
 - Gross load allocations for point and non-point sources
 - Implementation plan would follow
 - Identification of individual non-point and point source loads
 - Specific loads designated in NPDES permits
 - ?? Years
 - No New or Increased Discharge remains in effect until ?? year

MN TMDL Timeline Impact on New or Increased Discharges

- Future growth restricted/prohibited as individual facilities would each be required to:
 - Demonstrate downward trend in mercury levels (air, water, fish tissue, sediments, etc.);
 - Describe control requirements and authorities that require them;
 - Estimate of reductions that will occur;
 - Schedule of when required measures will be implemented;
 - Estimate when WQS will be attained; and
 - Develop a plan to monitor the time to attain WQS.

MN TMDL Timeline Impact on New or Increased Discharges

- Individual Facilities must develop the equivalent of an EIS
- Agency Review requires Citizen Board decision

Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report

5 Part Listing Guidance

5 Part Listing Guidance

- Category 1 Waters attaining WQS and no use threatened.
- Category 2 Attaining some designated uses; no use threatened; insufficient or no data/information available to determine if remaining uses are attained or threatened.
- Category 3 Insufficient or no data/information to determine if any designated use is attained.

5 Part Listing Guidance

- Category 4 Impaired or threatened for one or more use but does not require TMDL development.
 - A. TMDL has been completed.
 - B. Other pollution control requirements are reasonably expected to result in attainment of WQS in the near future.
 - C. Impairment not caused by pollutant

5 Part Listing Guidance

Category 5 – WQS is not attained. Impaired or threatened for one or more designated use by a pollutant and requires a TMDL.

Category 4b Listing Requirements

- Demonstrate downward trend in mercury levels (air, water, fish tissue, sediments, etc.);
- Describe control requirements and authorities that require them;
- Estimate of reductions that will occur;
 - Schedule of when required measures will be implemented;
- Estimate when WQS will be attained; and
- Develop a plan to monitor the time to attain WQS.

Advantages of Category 4b versus TMDL's

- provide short term flexibility to permit new/increased discharges
- demonstrated ability to maintain progress towards attainment of WQS
- immediate focus on reduction efforts
- focus on what we can impact (local reductions)
- consistent with and supplements ECOS/Quicksilver objectives (A plan is in place)
- provides incentive for cooperative efforts
- Efficient use of scarce resources
- TMDL's still an option (Category 5)

Disadvantages of Category 4b versus TMDL's

- Breaking new ground
- Not a Slam/Dunk

4b Implementation Strategy

- Cooperative effort
 - MPCA/TICRI/Industry
 - Others ??
- Discussions with EPA
 - Headquarters/Region ??
 - Timing soon
- Submittal Timeframe
 - No later than 4/1/04

Basis for a Minnesota Category 4b Demonstration

Keys concepts

- Minnesota has been a national leader in development and implementation of mercury reduction efforts (MMRI).
- Atmospheric reductions left to EPA and International community.
- EPA has provided ability to estimate reductions
 e.g. Mercury Maps, Other EPA Mercury TMDL's,

- Atmospheric Deposition addressed through
 - International efforts
 - National efforts
 - MACT/Clear Skies

- Voluntary/Regulatory efforts
 - Regional
 - Lake Superior Binational Program
 - Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy
 - Lakewide Area Management Plans (LaMP's)
 - Areas of Concern (AOC's)

- Voluntary/Regulatory efforts (cont.)
 - State and Local Framework exists
 - Minnesota Mercury Reduction Initiative
 - Voluntary agreements
 - Local plans (i.e. WLSSD)
 - Local residential and industrial collection efforts
 - Most sectors involved in some manner
 - Industries engaged in researching technological controls

- Regulatory efforts will continue to protect resources
 - Existing state regulations
 - Product bans
 - Pollutant minimization plans
 - Great Lakes Basin
 - Expand mercury monitoring to all water dischargers

- Monitoring Plans and Indicators exist or are under development
 - LSBP, GLBTS, LaMP's, AOC's
 - Water column, fish tissue, sediment, atmospheric, products, etc.
 - Minnesota Emission Inventory

- Schedules for Attainment
 - Addressed within program areas
 - Based on determination of source and contribution
 - Dependent on atmospheric timelines (International and National)
 - Reasonable timeframe for mercury?

Statewide/Multi-discharger Variance Provision

Definitions

- Variance Process by which the MPCA, upon application of the responsible party, may grant a variance from a water quality standard. Granted under exceptional circumstances:
 - that strict enforcement of any provision of a standard would cause undue hardship,
 - is necessary for the public health, safety, or welfare;
 - that strict conformity with the standards would be unreasonable, impractical, or not feasible under the circumstances.
 - EPA will be advised of any permits which may be issued under this clause.

Permitting Guidance

- NPDES water discharge permitting guidance exists
- EPA pre-TMDL mercury permitting guidance lacking
- EPA's Watershed Rule is silent on NPDES/TMDL permitting

Current MPCA NPDES Mercury Permitting Policy

- Draft permitting policy developed in 2000 never finalized
- First NPDES Cycle: Require effluent low level mercury monitoring
 - Major Facilities, Utilities and Taconite facilities only
- Second Cycle: Establish effluent limit (Interim/Final)
 - Facilities are approaching this phase
- Third Cycle: ????

NPDES Mercury Permitting Policy Issues

- If effluent limit is not attainable options are:
 - Request individual variance
 - Source Reduction
 - Install control technology
 - Reverse Osmosis, Ion exchange, Zero Discharge
 - Low flows
 - Cost prohibitive
 - Ohio Findings Statewide economic showing

NPDES Mercury Permitting Policy Issues (cont.)

- All evidence supports point source discharges are *de minimis* sources of mercury
 - < .2 lb/year/facility</p>

NPDES Permit Recommendation

- Amend Minnesota Rules (7050 and 7052) to include a Statewide or Multi-Discharger Variance
 - Most facilities will need variances
 - Municipals might be an exception (WLSSD)
 - Variances will need to be renewed
 - Other GLI States have such a provision
 - Ohio (EPA Formally Approved) and Michigan
 - Indiana (possible proposal during tri-ennial review)
 - Efficient use of scarce resources
 - Provides flexibility as we move in the right direction

Other Factors Supporting Variance Provision

- Basic assumption is standard and designated use are attainable
- Applicable endpoint uncertainty
 - Water Column (HH or Wildlife)
 - Fish Tissue
 - Fish Advisory
- Impact of reductions from other programs on attainment of WQS
 - Atmospheric deposition
 - Non-point source

Other Factors Supporting Variance Provision (cont.)

- Relationship of wasteload and load allocations developed through TMDL process and NPDES permitting is undefined – guidance lacking
 - Anti-backsliding (uncertainty)

Other Factors Supporting Variance Provision (cont.)

- Phased TMDL's
- Impact of listing in Category 4b on permitting process is undefined
 - Uncharted territory
- Trading Program Development ??

Other Factors Supporting Variance Provision (cont.)

- National Academy of Sciences has acknowledged that standards/designated use review should be part of the impaired waters/TMDL process (Assessing The TMDL Approach To Water Quality Management 2001)
- The U.S. General Accounting Office and States recognize the need for improved EPA guidance to better target cleanup efforts (Report GAO-03-308)

Other Approaches

- Compliance Schedules
 - Use of interim and final effluent limits